# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**
**United States Patent and Trademark Office**
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/684,627 | 10/14/2003 | Martin Ball | D/A1547 | 3743 |

25453 7590 10/06/2006

PATENT DOCUMENTATION CENTER
XEROX CORPORATION
100 CLINTON AVE., SOUTH, XEROX SQUARE, 20TH FLOOR
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| YANG, CLARA I | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2612 | |

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | **Application No.**<br>10/684,627 | **Applicant(s)**<br>BALL, MARTIN | |
| | **Examiner**<br>Clara Yang | **Art Unit**<br>2612 | |

***-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 August 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-8 and 18-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *9-17* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-8 and 18-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) ✓
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. The applicant wishes to defer taking action with regards to claims 1, 2, and 4-6 being provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, and 9-12 of co-pending application No. 10/685, 320. Consequently, the examiner will maintain the double patenting rejection.

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 03 August 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 6, the applicant states, "Further, claim 24 already includes the limitation present in dependent claim 2, so Applicant is unsure how the rejection to claim 2 could require the added Akiyoshi reference and not claim 24." Though claims 2 and 24 are similar, claim 2 calls for the step of granting "access to some, but not all of the features of the device," and claim 24 calls for the step of "allowing access to at least some features of the device." Harris teaches that an authenticated user is allowed to use the digital transmitting device (see Col. 5, lines 17-21 and 26-48); thus Harris teaches the step of allowing access to *at least some* features of the device but is silent on allowing access to some, *but not all,* of the features of the device. In other words, the step of allowing access to all features of the device teaches the limitation of "allowing at least some features". Akiyoshi, however, does teach the step of allowing access to some, but not all, of compound machine 100's features (see Section [0082]), as called for in claim 24.

In response to applicant's argument on pages 7-9 that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves ***or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art***. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, on pages 6-7 of the office action mailed on 03 May 2006, the examiner provides two motivations for combining Harris and Chow.

First, one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes that providing user identification information on an identification badge instead of a cover sheet makes Harris's MFP easier to use since employees generally wear their identification badges and can use the identification badge to access the MFP without having to generate or retrieve their cover sheets. On page 8, the applicant "questions the Examiner's ease-of-use claim as a coversheet can be fed through a sheet feeder along with a document, and a badge generally cannot be fed through a sheet feeder." The test for obviousness, however, is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Secondly, the second motivation to combine Harris and Chow is provided by Chow. On page 7 of the office action mailed on 03 May 2006, the examiner states, "In addition, using a picture in addition to using a bar code to authenticate a user is virtually immune to falsification (see Chow, Col. 2, lines 7-9), thereby further protecting the MFP from unauthorized use." By having the MFP authenticate an employee using the picture and bar code on his or her identification badge, security is improved, and costs are reduced since eliminating the need to print out the cover sheets saves paper.

On pages 10-11, the applicant focuses on the combination of Akiyoshi and Chow because "the Examiner has not provided sufficient motivation to combine Harris and Chow". As explained in the previous two paragraphs, the examiner does provide sufficient motivation to combine Harris and Chow. And on page 8 of the office action mailed on 03 May 2006, the examiner also indicates that Akiyoshi provides the motivation for combining Harris, as modified by Chow, with Akiyoshi (see Sections [0007], [0010], and [0015]).

### *Double Patenting*

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, and 9-12 of copending Application No. 10/685,320. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other as explained below.

Referring to claim 1 of the current application, the copending application teaches all the limitations: (a) optically scanning a tag, which is a badge containing a bar code, with a scanner (see the first limitation of Application No. 10/685,320's claim 1, and Application No. 10/685,320's claims 4 and 9-11); (b) receiving information from the badge (see the second limitation of Application No. 10/685,320's claim 1); and (c) allowing access to at least one specialty function if appropriate information is received from the badge (see the last limitation of Application No. 10/685,320's claim 1). The examiner notes that claim 10 of the copending application, which depends on claim 8, calls for "the scanner." "The scanner," however, lacks antecedent basis since claim 8 calls for an infrared signal, and claim 5 calls for the tag being part of a cellular telephone. Consequently, claim 10 is understood to depend on claim 9, because claim 9 calls for the device to include a scanner. In addition, the step of allowing access if appropriate information is received from the badge requires the step of determining whether the bearer of the badge can access any features of the device based upon the information scanned from the badge, as called for in the last limitation of the current application's claim 1.

Regarding claim 2 of the current application, Application No. 10/685,320's claim 1 calls for a printing device having a plurality of functions, wherein the bearer of a tag is allowed access to at least one function; thus access is granted to some, but not all, of the device's features.

Regarding claim 4 of the current application, the limitation is called for in Application No. 10/685,320's claim 11.

Regarding claim 5 of the current application, the limitation is called for in Application No. 10/685,320's claim 12.

Regarding claim 6 of the current application, the limitation is called for in Application No. 10/685,320's claim 1.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 4-8, and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris (US 6,799,717) in view of Chow et al. (US 6,292,092) and further in view of Akiyoshi (US 2003/0086111).

Referring to claims 1 and 21, Harris teaches a digital transmitter device that has an input device, a display, and a scanner (see Col. 1, lines 28-29). Per Harris, digital transmitting devices include multi-functional products (MFPs) having the capability of scanning hardcopy documents, copying, printing, etc., and a digital network copier (see Col. 1, lines 15-27). Harris also discloses that the digital transmitter device (hereinafter referred to as "MFP") has additional features such as e-mail and facsimile capability (see Col. 1, lines 37-67; Col. 2, lines 1-10; and Col. 4, lines 26-32 and 48-54); thus Harris' MFP is a scanning and printing device with a plurality of features, wherein the features include a scanner for scanning hardcopy documents into memory for use or manipulation, as called for in claim 1's preamble. Regarding claim 1, Harris discloses a method comprising the steps of (a) using the MFP's conventional scanner to optically scan the tags on the cover sheet when the cover sheet is place in front of the scanner (see Col. 4, lines 4-8 and 10-25; and Col. 5, lines 1-3); (b) receiving information from the tags during the scanning process (see Col. 4, lines 19-25 and Col. 5, lines 9-16); and (c) determining whether the bearer of the tag can access any of the MFP's features based on the information scanned from the tag (see Col. 4, lines 4-8 and 19-25; and Col. 5, lines 17-21 and 26-48). Harris's tag includes user identification information and is provided on a personalized cover sheet, which is made of durable media, instead of a badge (see Col. 3, lines 56-62; Col. 4, lines 12-25; and Col. 5, lines 9-16). A badge, as defined by the applicant (see [0021] and Fig. 3), is an identification badge. In addition, Harris is silent on the step of granting access to some, but not all, of the features of the MFP. Regarding claim 21, though Harris teaches using the MFP's conventional scanner to optically scan bar codes on a cover sheet and authenticate a user (see Col. 2, lines 35-38 and 53-54; Col. 4, lines 19-25; and Col. 5, lines 9-16), Harris is silent on a badge containing an image of the bearer, wherein the image is scanned and compared to a stored image in order to determine whether the user has access to the digital transmitting device.

In an analogous art, Chow teaches an personal identification system, wherein a personal identity instrument or tag (e.g., passports, credit cards, driver's licenses, building passes, etc.), as shown in Fig. 2, includes (1) area 1 providing biographical data of the legitimate holder of the tag, (2) area 2 providing a digital picture of the legitimate holder of the tag, and (3) area 3 providing authentication information encoded as a bar code (see Col. 2, lines 60-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-4). Chow specifies that the picture and the bar code are in machine-readable form (see Col. 3, lines 11-13). Chow further discloses that the authentication information includes information from the biographical data and from the digital picture (see Col. 3, lines 14-51) and that a commercial flatbed scanner, such as Hewlett-Packard Model IIc Scanjet, can be used to authenticate the tag (see Col. 4, lines 9-15 and Col. 5, lines 1-45). Chow's authentication method comprises the steps of (a) scanning an identity tag using scanner 11; (b) acquiring the biographical information from area 1 converting the information into a binary format via processor 13; (c) extracting image descriptors from the picture in area 2; (d) reading the bar code and decrypting the bar code information using a public decryption key; (e) comparing the biographical information obtained from the decrypted bar code information with biographical information acquired from area 1; and (f) comparing the image descriptors obtained from the decrypted bar code information with the image descriptors obtained from area 2 and saved in a local memory (i.e., a stored image). (See Col. 5, lines 9-36.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method of Harris as taught by Chow because providing user identification information on an identification badge (as called for in claim 1) instead of a cover sheet improves MFP's ease-of-use since employees generally wear their identification badges and can use the identification badge to access the MFP without having to generate or retrieve their cover sheets. In addition, costs are reduced since eliminating the need to print out the cover sheets saves paper. Furthermore, using a picture in addition to using a bar code to authenticate a user (as called for in claim 21) is virtually immune to falsification (see Chow, Col. 2, lines 7-9), thereby further protecting the MFP from unauthorized use.

Harris, as modified by Chow, however fails to teach the step of granting access to some, but not all, of the features of the MFP.

In another analogous art, Akiyoshi teaches a compound machine 100 (i.e., device) having a scanner for scanning images into memory, and a plurality of features, such as a facsimile, a black and white line printer 101, and a color line printer 102 (see Section [0047]). Akiyoshi's method for controlling compound machine 100, as shown in Fig. 11, includes the steps of: (a) reading a user code from flashcard 207 with flashcard interface part 206 at step

S1004 before the bearer of flashcard 207 can use compound machine 100 (see Fig. 2 and Section [0095]); (b) obtaining the user code from flashcard 207 during the reading process at step S1004 (see Section [0097]); and (c) determining from the user code whether the bearer of flashcard 207 can access any of the device's features at step S1006 (see Sections[ 0060], [0065]-[0067], [0081], [0082], [0098], and [0100]). Akiyoshi's method also includes the step of (d) granting access to some but not all of compound machine 100's features (see Sections [0060], [0065]-[0067], [0081], and [0082]), as called for in claim 2.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method of Harris and Chow as taught by Akiyoshi, because (1) it is undesirable, from the viewpoint of security, that every user can use all the functions of the MFP (see Akiyoshi, Section [0007]), and (2) the MFP's security is strengthened by determining which MFP features a user can access based on the user's identification information (see Akiyoshi, Sections [0010] and [0015]).

Regarding claims 4 and 22, Harris, as modified by Chow and Akiyoshi, discloses a badge including a bar code (as called for in claim 4) in addition to an image of the badge bearer, wherein determining whether the badge bearer has access is also based upon the information contained in the bar code (as called for in claim 22) (see Harris, Col. 2, lines 35-38 and 53-54; Col. 4, lines 19-25; and Col. 5, lines 9-16). Also see Chow, Col. 5, lines 9-36.

Regarding claims 5 and 23, Harris's method, as modified by Chow and Akiyoshi , includes determining whether the badge bearer has access is based on the badge's code and image (see Harris, Col. 2, lines 35-38 and 53-54; Col. 4, lines 19-25; and Col. 5, lines 9-16). Also see Chow, Col. 5, lines 9-36. Though Harris discloses that the code on a badge are not limited to bar codes, Harris and Chow fail to expressly teach that the badges can contain glyphs, as called for in claims 5, wherein determining whether the badge bearer has access is additionally based upon the information contained in the glyphs, as called for in claim 23. However, the applicant teaches in Section [0022] of the specification that "[bar] codes and glyphs are well known in the art," and the statement is taken to be admitted prior art. Hence it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Harris and Chow's tag such that it contains glyphs since glyphs provide efficient, aesthetically acceptable codes for recording digital data, especially for applications in which such machine readable data is to be recorded in visual juxtaposition with human readable information.

Regarding claim 6, as explained in the rejection of claim 1, Harris teaches that the MFP has the capability of scanning hardcopy documents, copying, printing, etc. (see Col. 1, lines 15-27; Col. 3, lines 63-67; and Col. 4, lines 63-67); thus Harris's MFP is a printing device.

Regarding claims 7, 18, and 19, Harris also discloses that the digital transmitter device has additional features such as facsimile capability (as called for in claims 7 and 19) and e-mail (as called for in claim 18) (see Col. 1, lines 37-67; Col. 2, lines 1-10; and Col. 4, lines 26-32 and 48-54).

Regarding claim 8, Harris discloses that the MFP is a scanner connected to a network in order to transmit the scanned document via facsimile or e-mail (see Col. 1, lines 15-27 and 37-67; Col. 2, lines 1-10; Col. 3, lines 50-55; and Col. 4, lines 26-32 and 48-54).

Regarding claim 20, per Harris, MFPs have the capability of scanning hardcopy documents, copying (i.e., document reproduction), printing, etc., and a digital network copier (see Col. 1, lines 15-27).

7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris (US 6,799,717) in view of Chow et al. (US 6,292,092).

Referring to claim 24, Harris' MFP, as explained in the previous rejection of claim 1, is a scanning and printing device with a plurality of features, wherein the features include a scanner for scanning hardcopy documents into memory for use or manipulation, as called for in claim 24's fourth limitation. Harris discloses a method comprising the steps of (a) programming the MFP, which has a plurality of features (e.g., e-mail, facsimile, scanning, copying, printing, etc.), with information related to authorized individuals (i.e., a defined group or set of individuals) (see Col. 3, lines 56-62; Col. 4, lines 4-8; and Col. 5, lines 17-21 and 36-48); (b) encoding information related to authorized individuals as tags that are printed onto a cover sheet and carried by authorized individuals (see Col. 2, lines 34-38 and 53-54; Col. 3, lines 56-62; Col. 4, lines 19-25; and Col. 5, lines 1-3 and 9-16); (c) using the MFP's conventional scanner to optically scan the tags on the cover sheet when the cover sheet is place in front of the scanner (see Col. 4, lines 4-8 and 10-25; and Col. 5, lines 1-3); (d) receiving information from the tags during the scanning process (see Col. 4, lines 19-25 and Col. 5, lines 9-16); (e) determining whether a bearer of the tag is an authorized individual (i.e., is one of the set of individuals) (see Col. 4, lines 4-8 and 19-25; and Col. 5, lines 9-21); (f) allowing access to at least some features of the MFP if the bearer is an authorized individual (see Col. 5, lines 17-21 and 26-48); and (g) denying access to at least some features if the bearer is not an authorized individual (see Col. 5, lines 17-21 and 26-41). Harris's tag includes user identification information and is provided on a personalized cover sheet, which is made of durable media, instead of a badge (see Col. 3, lines 56-62; Col. 4, lines 12-25; and Col. 5, lines 9-16). A badge, as defined by the applicant (see [0021] and Fig. 3), is an identification badge.

In an analogous art, Chow teaches an personal identification system, wherein a personal identity instrument or tag (e.g., passports, credit cards, driver's licenses, building passes, etc.),

as shown in Fig. 2, includes (1) area 1 providing biographical data of the legitimate holder of the tag, (2) area 2 providing a digital picture of the legitimate holder of the tag, and (3) area 3 providing authentication information encoded as a bar code (see Col. 2, lines 60-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-4). Chow specifies that the picture and the bar code are in machine-readable form (see Col. 3, lines 11-13). Chow further discloses that the authentication information includes information from the biographical data and from the digital picture (see Col. 3, lines 14-51) and that a commercial flatbed scanner, such as Hewlett-Packard Model IIc Scanjet, can be used to authenticate the tag (see Col. 4, lines 9-15 and Col. 5, lines 1-45). Chow's authentication method comprises the steps of (a) scanning an identity tag using scanner 11; (b) acquiring the biographical information from area 1 converting the information into a binary format via processor 13; (c) extracting image descriptors from the picture in area 2; (d) reading the bar code and decrypting the bar code information using a public decryption key; (e) comparing the biographical information obtained from the decrypted bar code information with biographical information acquired from area 1; and (f) comparing the image descriptors obtained from the decrypted bar code information with the image descriptors obtained from area 2 and saved in a local memory (i.e., a stored image). (See Col. 5, lines 9-36.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method of Harris as taught by Chow because providing user identification information on an identification badge instead of a cover sheet improves MFP's ease-of-use since employees generally wear their identification badges and can use the identification badge to access the MFP without having to generate or retrieve their cover sheets. In addition, using a picture in addition to using a bar code to authenticate a user is virtually immune to falsification (see Chow, Col. 2, lines 7-9), thereby further protecting the MFP from unauthorized use.

### *Conclusion*

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

⌘⌘⌘

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clara Yang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3062. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 7:30 PM, Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on (571) 272-7308. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CY
29 September 2006

WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600